DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 394 356 FL 023 791

AUTHOR de Jong, Ester J.
TITLE From Marginalization to Integrated Language Minority Education.
PUB DATE Feb 95
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for Bilingual Education (Phoenix, AZ, February 14-18, 1995).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Articulation (Education); *Bilingual Education; Bilingual Students; Educational Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Limited English Speaking; Program Design; *Social Integration; Teacher Role; *Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS *Language Minorities

ABSTRACT

It is argued that language minority education has generally been perceived as a separate program or model, and as a result has often become marginalized within its larger school setting, which negatively influences students, teachers, and the program. An alternative approach to program design, intended to avoid this marginalization by making language minority education an integral part of the entire school, is proposed. The key elements of such a program are described, including shared responsibility among staff members for all students, a coordinate curriculum with teacher collaboration, and student integration based on the principle of equal status. It is suggested that while this approach requires adjustment on the part of minority students and regular teachers as well as language minority students and specialist teachers, integration can be achieved in only such a setting. The challenges teachers must meet include organizing the classroom for integration rather than "submersion," with organization of tasks that assumes equal capability on the part of language-minority and language-majority students. Contains 40 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

© E.J. de Jong 1995

ED 394 356

FROM MARGINALIZATION TO INTEGRATED LANGUAGE MINORITY EDUCATION

By
Ester J. de Jong
Boston University

Paper presented at the National Association for Bilingual Education
Phoenix, Arizona
February 14-18, 1995

Contact address:
Ester J. de Jong, 90 Naples Rd. #4, Brookline, MA 02146
E-mail: ejdejong@acs.bu.edu

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ester J. de Jong

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL023791

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Contents

Abstract

1. Introduction

2. The Current Situation In Language Minority Education
2.1 Common Approaches to Language Minority Education
2.2 Characteristics of Language Minority Education

3. A Definition of Integrated Language Minority Education

4. Language Minority Education As an Integral Part of the School
4.1 Responsibility for the Education of All Students
4.2 Curriculum Coordination
4.3 Teacher Collaboration
4.4 Student Integration

5. Language Minority Education as a Deliberate and Multidirectional Process
5.1 Second Language Learning Opportunities and Academic Learning
5.2 Ensuring Equality in the Classroom

6. Conclusion

References

Abstract

Language minority education has generally been perceived as a separate program or model. Consequently, it has often become marginalized within its larger school setting which negatively influences students, teachers as well as the program offered. In this paper, an argument is made for an approach which avoids such marginalization by making language minority education an integral part of the entire school. Three key elements of such an 'integrated language minority education' approach are described: a shared responsibility among staff members for all students, a coordinate curriculum with teacher collaboration, and student integration based on a principle of equal status.

Integrated Language Minority Education[1]

Ester J. de Jong
Boston University

1. Introduction

Even if similarities can be found regarding the goals of language minority schooling (e.g. the need to learn the second language), there is strong disagreement among educators and policy makers on how to best reach these goals. One underlying issue that divides proponents and opponents of certain approaches is whether the needs of language minority students can best be met in a setting together with language majority peers or through a special program geared towards their needs. Martha Minow has referred to this conflict as the 'dilemma of difference', which she defines as the question whether "the stigma and unequal treatment encountered by minority groups [are] better remedied by separation or by integration of such groups with others?" The choice for either side is not an easy one because "[e]ither remedy risks reinforcing the stigma associated with assigned differences by either ignoring it or focusing on it." (Minow, 1985:157)

This paper argues that the most common responses to linguistic and cultural diversity in schools are representative of an 'either/or' approach to the dilemma of difference. It proposes an alternative way of defining language minority education which takes an inclusive, rather than exclusive, approach to language minority education. After characterizing current approaches to language minority programs, the paper will define 'integrated language minority education' as an alternative. It will describe some of the key elements of this approach and identify examples of such programs. The paper concludes by identifying some of the major rationales and issues involved in 'integrated language minority education'.

2. The Current Situation In Language Minority Education

2.1 Common Approaches to Language Minority Education

Few programs currently implemented operate on either side of the dilemma of difference. Exceptions can be found in submersion programs where students are integrated with no special support; and separate schools for language minority students where students kept separated more or less completely from their peers, like national schools in Bavaria, Germany (McLaughlin, 1985: 44-45). The majority of the approaches, however, are more accurately classified as programs which simultaneously integrate and segregate, but differ in the extent that they feel integration is necessary as an initial step.

Some programs place more emphasis on bringing language minority and language majority students together as much as possible. In this case students are generally assigned to regular programs but receive some support in the second language. This model is quite common in Europe, specifically for the younger students who are entering the school in the lower grades. Schools in the EC countries

[1] This paper is based on two chapters to be published in: Glenn, C.L, De Jong, E.J. (forthcoming). Minority Languages in School. New York: Garland Publishers

may in addition organize home language classes which focus on language development, the students' cultural background and which address issues of identity and self-esteem. Home language classes generally operate outside the regular curriculum and could therefore be referred to as 'enrichment' classes.

At the other end of the continuum are programs which stress the specific needs of language minority students that can be better addressed in a smaller classroom setting where special attention is paid to their needs. The goal of this is to prepare them, in a secure environment, for interacting with their peers and helps them to gradually adjust to the curriculum and instruction in the 'regular' classroom. For older students, these programs are generally temporary reception classes, most of which immerse students in the second language. Younger students in the United States have the option of participating in, predominantly transitional, bilingual programs, where the first language is used as medium of instruction to varying degrees. Bilingual programs are intended to teach subject matter in addition to language skills. Figure 1 summarizes the different options discussed above. For more detailed overviews see Fase (1994) for some countries in Western-Europe; August and Garcia (1988) for the United States.

Figure 1 Educational responses to linguistic and cultural diversity

I. Assignment to a regular class
   1. Regular class with no support ('submersion')
   2. Regular class with supplemental second language development help
   3. Regular class with home language enrichment

II. Assignment to a special program
   1. Reception (immersion) programs
   2. Bilingual programs

The educational models discussed above represent common responses of schools to the presence of language minority students in schools. Those focusing on immediate insertion in a 'regular' class (Type I) claim that only by exposing students to the same curriculum as majority students and by making language minority students part of the 'regular' classroom setting will they have access to the educational system. Their critics argue that the special language support offered is not effective and will lead to a situation in which language minority students will not learn for a long period of time because they do not have access to what is happening in the classroom.

Supporters of special programs (Type II), on the other hand, charge that a special program can mobilize resources and expertise to more effectively address the need of language minority students so that they may gain equal footing with their peers. Opponents contend that treating them differently

from others may cause isolation and stigmatization. In addition, they say that the separation involved will result in the social isolation of language minority students which may in turn influence the students' opportunity to practice the second language.

Schools have tended to formulate an either/or response to linguistic and cultural diversity, i.e. they have either ignored or overemphasized differences as a way to address the needs of language minority students. This characteristic has shaped much of the debate in language minority education in general.

Despite these differences, the various programs are quite similar in the way they define language minority education. In the next section will fous on three of these common characteristics, which constitute the basis for the way language minority education has been and is still conceptualized.

2.2. Characteristics of Language Minority Education

Regardless of their focus, current language minority education models have three aspects in common: they tend to concentrate on language issues; they represent a programmatic, 'model'-based approach; and they expect a one-way change to occur. Each of these characteristics will be described and discussed below.

The first characteristic is that the approaches tend to focus on language issues, which assumes that language minority school failure can be best explained in linguistic terms. This is too simplistic an approach to the issues around language minority education for at least two reasons (see also Paulston, 1978). First, it ignores other student characteristics which range from socioeconomic to sociocultural and learning style differences which also impact a student's school success. The focus on language sometimes makes us forget that language minority students are children in the first place, not just second language learners! Secondly, the focus on language has often turned language minority programs into language classes, often at the cost of thinking about 'education'.

Even though bilingual programs in the United States are intended to be less limited in scope, one look at program evaluations makes clear that they too are ultimately evaluated in linguistic terms, more specifically in terms of second language proficiency. A meta-analysis of a number of well-designed evaluation studies by Willig (1985) illustrates the focus on linguistic issues. In her analysis, 73% of the effects considered are language-related. The remaining 27% refer to findings for math (16%), social studies (0.7%), general achievement (5.8%), and attitudes/self-concept (4.7%). This pattern seems representative of the great majority of the bilingual program evaluations.

A second, and perhaps even more pervasive, characteristic of language minority education is that it has been perceived as a temporary, programmatic solution which is added on to the regular program. These solutions are preferably defined in terms of 'models' which are implemented uniformly throughout a particular state or country. Besides the lack of flexibility which results from such an approach, another side-effect is that language minority education has become the responsibility

of specialists. The existence of a special program tends to give non-specialists the excuse not to deal with language minority students.

> It demobilizes the other teachers . .; because a "specialist" is concerned with these problems, the non-specialists feel relieved of them and have a tendency not to adapt their practices to the presence of these pupils and their specific [needs and strengths] (Berque, 1985:11)

The recognition of these practices in the 'regular' classroom may, in turn, prevent the specialists from mainstreaming children as fast as possible. As Haeffele (1988) comments:

> There is a great temptation to keep newly-arrived children in a closed CLIN [initation classes in France] (a serious deviation which is unfortunately common), reinforced by the attitude of other teachers who, using the pretext of the existence of the CLIN, often refuse to integrate the students during the course of the year, even if the CLIN teacher recommends that . .. (Haeffele, 1988: 31)

The fact that school staff tends to see responding to the concerns and educational needs of minority groups as something done by somebody else with a specialized assignment may prevent an effective response to the overall educational needs of language minority pupils as an aspect of school improvement. Too often, as a result, expectations for language minority students are lowered in the regular program. In a study in Birmingham, it was found that

> lower standards and expectations were inevitable with a multiracial intake, and, although they tried to make schools a pleasant environment, [they] did not expect high achievement. This, of course, was the antithesis of the expectations and understandings of minority parents as to what schools were all about (Tomlinson, 1984: 152).

A final characteristic, which is closely related to the one above, is that each of these programs aim at 'fixing' the language minority child 'problem' as quickly as possible so that s/he can then be inserted into the mainstream without difficulty. The 'special' program is expected to change the language minority child in such a way that no changes have to be made in the 'regular' program. In other words, it is the 'regular' program which sets the norm to which the special program(s) adapt.

A concept which connects these three characteristics is 'marginalization'. Reinforced by the either/or approach described above, language minority education (the teachers involved, and the students) has often been put in a marginalized position in schools. Marginality, in this case, refers to a situation in which language minority programs operate in the periphery of the school and do not become an integral part of the school context. This process of marginalization of language minority

education negatively affects all aspects of language minority schooling, from school organization (e.g. scheduling) to student relationships (e.g. social isolation). These issues will be discussed in more detail below.

It is therefore not surprising that educators are looking for alternatives to the existing situation. They recognize the need to avoid the negative consequences of marginalization while capitalizing on the expertise developed in special programs. They attempt to find a way around the either/or approach which has dominated the field of language minority eductation. In the following I offer a framework for what I refer to as 'integrated language minority education', which seeks to incorporate a more inclusive approach to the 'dilemma of difference'.

3. A Definition of Integrated Language Minority Education

Integrated language minority education stands in direct contrast to the marginalization described above. It is based on the assumption that in order to provide language minority students with the language abilities, academic knowledge, and learning strategies as well as the social and cultural skills they need to function in a culturally and linguistically diverse society, schools will have to make language minority education an integral part of the school context. This will be referred to as 'integrated language minority education'. Integration, in this context, is defined as a deliberate, multidirectional process, that recognizes language minority students' cultural and linguistic background as an integral part of the educational environment without systematically segregating their schooling.

Integrated language minority education differs from the approaches discussed above on a crucial dimension. Instead of advocating a special program or model for a special target population, it argues that the entire school should be involved as a whole in educating bilingual students. This 'whole school approach' principle departs from the conventional definition of language minority education in three ways:

1) integrated language minority education starts with the assumption that all staff members are responsible for all students in the school. The establishment of a strong sense of ownership for the education of all students is a necessary ingredient for successful language minority education.

2) integrated language minority education requires the coordination of curriculum and collaboration among teachers instead of implementing a dual system within the school. One of the purposes of such a coordination is to address the unequal status of minority program and language in the school.

3) integrated language minority education asks for the integration rather than the separation of students for academic purposes. This requirement needs to be accompanied by carefully planned instructional and curricular change.

Few programs have been implemented based on these key elements. An exception in the United States are the two-way bilingual programs. These programs integrate language minority and language majority students and aim at bilingualism for all students. Two-way programs have the potential of avoiding the negative effects of assimilation and segregation: students in two-way programs are taught together; the native language of language minority students is used for academic learning and is maintained throughout the program; and minority teachers can serve as positive models. The model allows for natural and extensive exposure to the dominant language, while at the same time giving the minority language a high status in the school. In addition, the integrated activities can enhance cross-cultural attitudes (Glenn and LaLyre, 1991; see also below). Evaluations of these programs tend to be positive for first and second language development and math (e.g. Lindholm and Alclan, 1991). Unfortunately, research on the actual practices in these programs is still absent, which leaves many questions unanswered regarding the process of implementing a successful two-way bilingual program.

Another example is an integration project by Brisk (1991) involving a 5th grade monolingual and a transitional bilingual education class. Students were grouped by their own homeroom (i.e. monolingual or bilingual classroom) for morning activities, social studies and English as a Second Language. They were integrated for reading and language arts, math and science. Flexible grouping practices were an important key to the success of the program: bilingual students were grouped by homeroom, with English-speaking peers or with mainstreamed bilingual students. The language of instruction changed accordingly: Spanish-only, English-only, or bilingually (with the bilingual teacher). Adjustments in the groups were made for individual students throughout the year. The project created a safe learning environment for all students, allowing the use of the students' first language and providing supportive opportunities for interactions with native speakers. Brisk found that the program had a positive impact all students academically and socially. Teachers felt they benefitted as well in that they developed themselves professionally learning how to deal more effectively with second language learners.

The need for each of the proposed three elements will be expanded upon and illustrated in the following sections. It has to be kept in mind, however, that little research has been done that directly explores these issues[2]. The discussion below will therefore, besides referring to the available literature, draw from my own research that I conducted in Massachusetts (a two-month qualitative evaluation of a transitional bilingual education program, Spring 1993), and in The Netherlands, Denmark, and Sweden (conducted during several-day visits to six different schools and a month-long observation of one school, Fall 1993), all involving observations in language minority programs and teacher interviews.

---

[2] Like marginalization, integrated language minority education looks at the relationship between a language minority program and the surrounding school context. In contrast, research has focused on either language minority programs or on regular program but seldom on the relationship between the two.

4. Language Minority Education As an Integral Part of the School

4.1 Responsibility for the Education of All Students

Language minority education should not be marginalized in schools but needs to become an integral part of the school setting. The importance of recognizing the interdependence between the bilingual program and the rest of the school is supported by a study by Carter and Chatfield (1986). They found that the effectiveness of the bilingual program was closely associated with the effectiveness of the entire school. Carter and Chatfield point out that the relationship between the bilingual program and other aspects of the school organization is a complex and not a linear one. Projects implemented in the bilingual program affect the entire school and vice versa: the effectiveness of the entire school influenced the policies at the bilingual program level. They conclude:

> Lauderbach is an effective school with an effective bilingual program. The bilingual program is not a separate part of the school but rather participates in, partakes of, *and contributes to* the positive student and educational climate outcomes. (italics in the original; Carter and Chatfield, 1986: 226)

Similar findings were reported by Lucas et al. (1990; see also Lucas, 1993) who looked at six high schools reported by officials and principals to be effective with language minority students. From their study, the authors conclude that

> ... this study strongly suggests that the diversity among students cannot simply be ignored. While the schools recognized the importance of integrating language-minority students with mainstream students and providing equally challenging instruction for all students, they did not try to minimize differences among mainstream and Latino students or among Latino students themselves. Approaches to schooling that value linguistic and cultural diversity and that promote cultural pluralism were welcomed and explored whenever possible....Students' languages and cultures were incorporated into school programs as part of the efforts to create a context in which all students felt valuable and capable of academic success. (Lucas et al., 1990: 338)

In contrast, the existence of separate programs often undermines the feeling of responsibility for the language minority students. Teachers tend to feel responsible only for the students who are physically in their classroom. Consequently, when issues arise with bilingual students, they are delegated to the bilingual staff rather than dealt with collaboratively.

> There's different degrees of ownership among mainstream staff in terms of owning the Hispanic community, feeling that they are responsible for them in the same way that they are responsible for the rest of the population. It's basically that attitude, that we're supposed to pick up where everyone has left.[community outreach person, USA; De Jong, 1993a]

The lack of ownership negatively affects the relationship between the special programs and the regular program in several ways. Separate responsibility often translates into a lack of knowledge about each other's curriculum and expertise. As a result, issues of multiculturalism, second language teaching methodology often do not make it to the regular classroom. Monolingual teachers, even when they have bilingual children in their classroom, are therefore frequently not prepared (and/or willing) to face the challenge of effecively educating language minority students. The lack of ownership can also be reflected in decision-making processes, where language minority teachers often do not feel included in curriculum decisions. Ultimately, a separate, compensatory program increases the likelihood that the regular program becomes 'the norm' and that the goals of other programs become subordinate to it.

> Then I get all these other people in the system, administrators and teachers out of the bilingual program who are asking you 'How come you're not teaching English?' I have to justify what I am doing. That's hard. Other teachers that are not in the bilingual program. All the time you have to defend what you're doing. [bilingual teacher, USA] (De Jong, 1993a)

4.2 Curriculum Coordination

It is important to offer students a coherent curriculum in order to provide an opportunity for continuous cognitive and linguistic development. If students participate in a 'special' program, this goal necessarily requires a high degree of coordination between that program and the 'regular' program. Only then will students be enabled to continue their academic development without significant developmental interruption when they move from one program to the other.

In reality, the existence of a 'dual system' may significantly undermine such contintuity. How this happens is best illustrated by looking at a process which is inherent to the language minority programs: the mainstreaming process. Mainstreaming is the procedure which takes a language minority pupil out of the special program (a bilingual program, a second language reception class) and transfers him or her into the 'regular' program.

Mainstreaming makes certain assumptions about the language minority student. First, it is assumed that the student has the second language skills to effectively participate in a regular classroom. Much of the debate around assessment and exit-criteria has centered around what kinds of language skills would be necessary for such participation (e.g. Cummins, 1984). However, more than just language skills are a prerequisite for meaningful participation. Mainstreaming also assumes that bilingual students have had access to a similar knowledge base as students the regular education context. This knowledge base includes academic knowledge in terms of subject matter (e.g. certain science concepts) as well as social and cultural knowledge (e.g. being able to work independently; how to interact with others).

Given these assumptions, it is clear how the lack of curriculum coordination and integration can undermine successful mainstreaming. First and foremost, language minority students are not necessarily exposed to the same materials and content matter as students in the 'regular' program.

> As far as the other subjects are concerned in the preparatory classes:
> - for geography [the teacher] starts it when they have come a long way in Swedish first. Then [the teacher] will discuss terms which can be found frequently in geography books, such as river, mountain, climate; and maps, the parts of the world.
> - for biology [the teacher] will discuss things like the body parts, flowers, animals
> - religion is discussed when it comes up, not as a subject. Then they will compare what different cultures do. [Observation notes, Sweden] (De Jong, 1993b)

> Everybody doesn't work with the same theme. That would be nice if we did it. [We all did an] apple unit in September. But then one wants to do dinosaurs, the other oceans. It would be nice to do the same theme. All the [bilingual] kids see the [other class' project] and say 'O, I like dinosaurs. I would like to do dinosaurs'. [Bilingual teacher, USA] (De Jong, 1993a)

These examples illustrate how students are confronted with gaps in the curriculum content as a result of the separateness of programs. They are also made aware of differences between what they do and what other students do. If such discrepancies occur systematically, students can be excluded from learning about certain concepts in various subjects which will make it difficult for them to have successful access to the curriculum in the 'regular' program.

The lack of coordination also does not give the language minority student the opportunity of being exposed to the regular classroom and gain familiarity with the teacher, classroom expectations, and the language majority students. Not knowing the 'regular' classroom may result in a fear and reluctance to go into the 'regular' classroom.

> AK also mentioned that generally the students didn't want to leave the preparatory classes because they felt so comfortable. It's a luxury, she said, small groups. [director home language classes, Sweden] (De Jong, 1993b)

> ... the preparatory classes as a small group is like a family and very good for the students as a first step. But then they need to broaden their horizons and move out. They are often afraid to do so ... but they need to learn. [preparatory teacher, Sweden] (De Jong, 1993b)

Moreover, the secure environment which has been adapted linguistically, and sometimes culturally, to the needs of the language minority child in the special program is rarely repeated in the mainstream class. In addition, in some programs students move from a small group to a large group

setting. Students are therefore confronted with a significant change in the kind of classroom they are in. Besides that, the lack of interactions with members of the new culture also decreases the opportunity to learn about that culture and may reinforce negative attitudes and stereotypes. These factors make successful mainstreaming more difficult. In an ethnographic study of successful bilingual adults, subjects felt that one of the drawbacks of the bilingual program was that it did not prepare them for dealing with the American culture.

> Students felt that although the bilingual program had been excellent in preparing them academically for college, they were not prepared to deal socially with their American peers. This problem is related to the school's structure as a whole. There was minimal integration between the bilingual and mainstream programs.... Both students and teachers did not feel accepted by the principal or their English-speaking peers (Brisk, 1993:51).

Students in the study experienced difficulties in relating to their American peers and teachers. As one student recalls, "I had friends...that didn't dare walk into a monolingual class because they were scared and embarrassed. And if they had an accent it was worse." (Brisk, 1993:52)

The combination of an adapted environment and a lack of confrontation with 'regular' program expectations may therefore lower language minority students' chances to succeed in the regular classroom. Philips (1972) cautions against implementing programs which specifically adapt curriculum and instruction to the cultural background of the students because doing so may not adequately prepare language minority students for 'the mainstream'.

> The teachers who make these adjustments, and not all do, are sensitive to the inclinations of their students and want to teach them through means to which they most readily adapt. However, by doing so they are avoiding teaching the Indian children precisely in the contexts in which they are least able but most need to learn if they are "to do well in school." (Philips, 1972: 383)

4.3 Teacher Collaboration

Curriculum coordination presupposes that teachers collaborate on curricular and instructional issues. Carter and Chatfield (1986) found that such collaboration was an important characteristic of their effective bilingual program.

> Collaborative teaching has contributed to a total ownership of the bilingual program. The bilingual strand is not separated from the total school endeavor. Monolingual teachers and aides commented in interviews that the bilingual program was important and positive. (Carter and Chatfield, 1986:223)

Bilingual teachers I interviewed in my own research also indicated that they found such collaboration necessary and effective:

> It was very important that we needed to collaborate. We need to find out what's going on in the mainstream and get involved with them and them with us. It's really proven to be a very positive thing because once the dialogue was initiated, there was so much misunderstanding between what was going on in the mainstream program, between the teachers and curriculum people. [bilingual curriculum coordinator] (De Jong, 1993a)

The reality of language minority education, however, is that language minority teachers frequently feel isolated and unaccepted and identify the relationship with their colleagues in the 'regular' program as unequal. The low status and disconnection with the rest of the school affects the teacher's status (and therefore also their position as positive role models) as well as their teaching. Montero-Sieburth and Perez (1987), for example, found that a bilingual teacher's ability to effectively address her students' needs was clearly influenced by the school's attitudes and the status of the bilingual program in the school.

> The fact that the special classes to which bilingual teachers are assigned are transitional - akin to a waiting room, where students are to stay until they are admitted to the mainstream - induces a sense of marginality in the teacher. Thus the bilingual teacher comes to feel the very sense of isolation... that is also the fate of the migrant student. (Montero-Sieburth and Perez, 1987:187)

The bilingual teacher interviewed defined her position as "being a second-class member of an already devalued profession." (Montero-Sieburth and Perez, 1987:187). Similarly, in a study of four experienced bilingual teachers, teachers expressed "their pain over not having been accepted initially by their monolingual colleagues in their schools." (Lemberger, 1992:9) As one of the teachers put it

> They really didn't want to have much ... to do with us. They had these old faithfuls. There was really a schism. They would just go to their rooms for lunch and wouldn't have anything to do with you. They'd barely say hello.. (Lemberger, 1992:9)

The unequal status between the monolingual and bilingual teachers appears most directly when monolingual and bilingual teachers are together in a team-teach situation. Often, the roles of the two teachers are far from being equal.

> The Turkish teacher also did some co-teaching with the Dutch as a Second Language teacher. At one session the Dutch teacher was standing up front of the students going through a vocabulary listing related to bicycles in Dutch. The Turkish teacher sat on a table behind the students. Later the Turkish teacher tells me that his main role in these classes is to translate. The Dutch teacher gives him the vocabulary list that they will

> deal with, so that he can translate the words and glue the work sheets in the children's notebooks. He feels that the Dutch teacher leaves all the handy work to him; sometimes he doesn't get the words to him in time to prepare. [Observation notes, the Netherlands] (De Jong, 1993b)

> In the beginning there was no equal status because they [the Swedish teachers] didn't trust him [the bilingual teacher] that he could do the work. He didn't do the same amount of work. This has changed now and this has improved relations much. Of course he could do it but it's very hard to work together with the home language teacher. [Observation notes, Sweden] (De Jong, 1993b)

> "You have to give all the time, and you get nothing back. [He] never comes with his own initiative. Then you stop." [regular teacher, Sweden] (De Jong, 1993b)

Hagman and Lahdenpera (1988: 329) mention this phenomenon, stating that

> even when [the teachers] co-operated reasonably well, the children soon learned who was the 'real' teacher. Two teachers from different cultures cannot reach equal status when one of them is the representative of the majority, unless something special is done about it.

Asked about the difference between teaching her home language classes and being in a co-teaching setting with Danish teachers, one of the Turkish bilingual teachers said the following:

> When I'm alone, then I'm more independent... There is no boundary. I am by myself. I decide what I'm going to teach;.. It's my class and MY children. I have my own rules... I know them [the children] with their culture and their language. The other situation, with the Danish teacher. ...I think it's the same for all bilingual teachers... the Danish teacher is the first person. I am a teacher or I am an assistant. What kind of picture does [the Danish teacher] have of a bilingual teacher? [bilingual teacher, Denmark] (De Jong, 1993b)

4.4 Student Integration

The importance of bringing language minority and language majority students together is motivated by several reasons. One reason is the danger of stigmatizing students when they are in a special program. This may affect the status of the students in the school as well as the expectations teachers may have from language minority students.

The most convincing argument put forward in favor of student integration relates to the opportunities for language acquisition. When analyzing the process of second language learning,

Wong-Fillmore (1991) concludes that

> [t]hose situations that promote frequent contacts are the best, especially if the contacts last long enough to give learners ample opportunity to observe people using the language for a variety of communicative purposes. Those which also permit learners to engage in the frequent use of the language with speakers are even better. (Wong Fillmore, 1991:54)

Similarly, Garcia (1991a), after reviewing the literature on bilingualism and second language acquisition, concludes that "[f]or Chicano language minority students, a schooling context which promotes L1 and provides the opportunity for L2 interaction is most likely to achieve successful L2 acquisition." (1991:105) The lack of contact between a special program and the regular program will not easily provide language minority students with meaningful opportunities for natural interactions. As Snow (1990) points out, "[i]t seems paradoxical to try to teach children English by isolating them from the large numbers of native English speakers available in the mainstream classes of their schools..." (Snow, 1990:61)

A third rationale has already been referred to in relationship to the mainstreaming process. Most likely, the separation for academic purposes will also negatively influence social relationships among students as well. As students are kept separate, they do not get a chance to get to know each other and/or learn to work together. Such social and academic isolation may affect the acculturation process (see above) as well as the quality of the interactions among students. Social isolation may therefore decrease the languge minority student's exposure to and interaction with natural second language models.

> Well, they don't play together real well on the playground at the [school] because they don't get along that well. They don't have much chance to get to know each other. [bilingual teacher, USA] (De Jong, 1993a)

> First of all they were identifying each other by their ethnic group and their language and there was very little integration. And it was tough even to get them together to go down to the specialist because there was the 'Spanish' line and the 'English' line. And they would fight on who would go first. I mean they would be together, but they would be separate. [bilingual curriculum coordinator, USA] (De Jong, 1993a)

Zanger (1987; in Zanger, 1991), for instance, found that the social isolation of Vietnamese students negatively affected their English literacy skills. Their attendance of a bilingual program was combined with avoiding English-speaking students, which hampered their learning of the second language.

It is important to also keep in mind that the academic and social isolation of students also

affects the language majority child. The lack of exposure to other languages and cultures may easily result in maintaining stereotypic images of ethnic groups. Language majority pupils will not learn to be comfortable with a multilingual environment and hearing languages other than their own. This will in turn affect the ways they interact with language minority students and their willingness to be language models (see above). They, too, will be poorly prepared to deal with a diverse environment if separated from their peers.

5. Language Minority Education as a Deliberate and Multidirectional Process

Integration will not be achieved by simply putting students physically together in a room or by asking a bilingual and a monolingual teacher to teach together. The literature on racial desegregation has emphasized again and again the importance of deliberate action on behalf of the school and its staff for successful integration (e.g. Weinberg, 1977). Integration will only succeed when it is accompanied by careful planning and appropriate changes in curriculum and instructional strategies. In addition, such change cannot be considered a one-way street. Within the context of an integrated approach, changes are expected to be made by majority students and 'regular' teachers as well as by language minority students and 'specialist' teachers. Teachers and student have to be enabled to interact and learn from each other on the basis of having an equal status. These issues are only starting to be recognized by researchers and little is known about the most effective way to meet this challenge.

5.1 Second Language Learning Opportunities and Academic Learning

The first challenge teachers have to meet is how to organize their classroom for an integrated setting (see also Brisk and De Jong, 1993). Integrated classrooms have to avoid becoming a submersion classroom, where no adaptations are being made to make the language input accessible to students or to allow for active, meaningful use of the second language. Such unadapted classrooms will increase the "tendency of LEP children to disengage entirely either from group activity which is not focused on them or from individual activity that is given little direction." (Saville-Troike, 1984; in Flanigan, 1988: 30-31) This disengagement will not only affect the second language learning process, but academic learning in general.

Research on second language acquisition suggests that certain learning environments are more conducive to second language learning than others. Principles which apply to the second language classroom also apply to an integrated setting. That is, integrated classrooms have to create a learning environment which meets the need for exposure to a level of language use which is understood by the learner ('comprehensible input', Krashen, 1982), the need for students to actively engage in the process of making sense of the language input ('negotiation of meaning', Long, 1983) and the need to be stretched in negotiating for accurate language output ('negotiation of output', Swain, 1985). As Wong Fillmore (1991; see above) pointed out in an integrated setting these conditions can be met with native speakers as natural native language models in an integrated setting. Research seems to indicate at least two factors which may make optimal usage of the integrated setting.

First, research seems to indicate that negotiation occurs more frequently in child-child (peer) interactions. In adult-child converstions, negotiation can be more limited because the adult takes a leading role and consequently puts restraints on the amount and quality of student output (Garcia, 1991b). Such insights support a classroom organization which allows for peer interactions because that would give more opportunity for meaningful negotiation in the second language. The picture is more complex, however. For example, it seems that the effectiveness for peer interaction may depend on the students' cultural background (Wong Fillmore et al. 1985; in Chamot, 1988), or classroom composition (Varonis and Gass, 1984). If students depend more on the adult for interactions or when the majority of the students are second language learners from the same background, peer interactions for the purpose of second language learning may not be the most effective approach.

Secondly, more opportunities for language learning can be created by using tasks which require students to interact and to negotiate for meaning. Long and Porter (1985) suggest, for instance, that "modifications ... are more likely to occur when the native speaker and the non-native speaker each start out a conversation with information the other needs in order for the pair to complete some task successfully." (Long and Porter, 1985: 214) These kinds of tasks are classified as 'two-way' tasks because both participants depend on each other for learning.

Researchers are also looking at the effect of cooperative learning strategies or peer learning for language minority students. Most of these studies have been carried out within a bilingual education setting and found that peer-learning can be a more effective instructional strategy for language minority students, especially when in combination with a hands-on approach that builds on the students' interests (see Johnson, 1995 for an overview of this research). Long and Porter (1985) summarize the argument in favor of group work when they note that group work provides more opportunity for language practice, improves the quality of student talk, individualizes instruction, creates positive affective climate in the classroom, and increases student motivation. The presence of language majority students becomes especially important when the focus is not only on academic learning but also on second language learning. They can provide the native language models for social and academic interaction.

5.2 Ensuring Equality in the Classroom

The success of integration greatly depends on the steps taken by the teacher to ensure that language minority and language majority students meet each other on an equal footing. The instructional strategies addressed above assume that the teacher has organized the tasks in such a way that minority students do not feel less capable than majority students (or vice versa).

Such an approach requires, for instance, that the teacher respects and incorporates the students' linguistic and cultural background in her teaching. Such an approach will validate the students' own background. Research in effective bilingual classrooms also indicates that the free usage of their first language as an important factor for successful learning for language minority students (e.g. Garcia,

1988). Especially if students are not yet proficient enough in the second language, access to the first language becomes important for continuous cognitive development.

Cooperative learning strategies also will not have the desired effect if they are not structured around the principle of equal status and shared responsibility among all students. This holds true for cooperative learning in general (Slavin, 1990), but may have important consequences for language minority students. Varonis and Gass (1984), for example, warn that "inequality in the status of the participants (with regard to the language medium) actually discourages negotiation because it amplifies rather than masks the differences between them." (Varonis and Gass, 1984: 86) The two-way tasks described above can avoid this problem because it makes students dependent on each other for learning.

The inequality of students can also be perpetuated if teachers do not structure their tasks in such a way that language minority and language majority students have different roles. Without such planning, the likelihood is that second language learners will always remain in a learners' role, whereas majority students have the leading role of teacher. The effect of these practices becomes clear when the roles are changed. Edelsky (1991) describes how a monolingual Spanish teacher consciously violated the language norms in the class by refusing to take the learner's role and by teaching Spanish, the subordinate language in the classroom. The effect on the students was profound. It "gave the Spanish speaking peer partners a boost, evening up the usual asymmetry where they were always learners." (Edelsky, 1991:27) Without such interventions language minority students are likely to be always in the subordinate role of the learner in integrated classrooms.

These examples given above also illustrate the need for all students to learn to work together. Teachers have to model such behavior and equip students with the strategies for successful collaboration. Language majority students have to learn to accept a multilingual environment and their role as language models. By being exposed to diversity in a positive way, they will develop a more accepting frame of mind when interacting with peers who may differ from them linguistically and culturally. Clearly, integrating language majority students with language minority students will require changes in their attitudes and thinking about other cultures and language.

Finally, the equality of instruction is also highly dependent on the relationship between the teachers involved. For example, when teachers decide to use a team-teaching approach, it is important that they are aware of their respective role. Status differences among bilingual and monolingual teachers and their negative impact have already been discussed out above. In an integrated situation, teachers need to make sure that it is not always the monolingual teachers who initiates and directs instruction. They have to model the behavior they expect from their students.

6. Conclusion

The integrated approach I propose shifts away from current strategies to a whole-school approach. A whole-school approach has three key basic elements: the needs of language minority students are made an integral part of the school and are therefore the responsibility of all staff, teachers coordinate their instruction and content teaching, and students are integrated for academic purposes.

A focus on integration (in contrast to separation or assimilation) is supported by general learning theory as well as second language theory. I have argued that integrated language minority education will avoid some the pitfalls of the either/or approach which is currently being used and which marginalizes language minority education in the school. Instead of either ignoring or overemphasizing differences among students, integrated language minority education builds on the specific needs of language minority students within an integrated setting which is adapted to these needs. It does so within a school context which incorporates the students first language and culture as an integral part of curriculum and instruction, thus creating an additive learning environment for all students.

Integrated language minority education therefore requires teachers and schools to change their practices. Teachers need to reconsider their instructional strategies (creating optimal language learning opportunities), curriculum (taking students' sociocultural and linguistic background as a starting-point), and grouping strategies (cooperative learning, heterogeneous grouping). Integrated language minority education also asks teachers to plan and collaborate in order to provide students with a high quality, continuous curriculum, maintaining high expectations for all students. Instead of taking a 'specialist' viewpoint, integrated language minority education envisions a team-approach in which teachers share the responsiblity and their expertise to meet the needs of each individual student. Students' and teachers' negative experiences with marginalization clearly indicate the need for a school-wide approach to language minority education. The success of two-way bilingual programs and integrated bilingual programs indicate that such an inclusive approach, under the conditions presented above, may be a more effective approach to language minority education.

References

August, D., Garcia, E.E. (1988). Language minority education in the United States. Research, policy, and practice. Springfield, IL: Charles Thomas

Berque, J. (1985). L'Immigration a l'ecole de la republique. Paris: Centre National de Documentation Pedagogique.

Brisk, M.E. (1993). Reflections on bilingual education. A report card from elementary and secondary graduates. Paper preseNted at the Massachusetts Association for Bilingual Education conference, March.

Brisk, M.E. (1991). Towards multilingual and multicultural mainstream education. Journal of Education, 173 (2), 114-129

Brisk, M.E., De Jong,E.J. (1994). Conditions for quality bilingual education. Paper presented at the National Association for bilingual Education Conference, February, Los Angeles

Carter, T., Chatfield, M. (1986). Effective schools for language minority students. American Journal of Education, 97, 200-233.

Chamot, A.U. (1988). Bilingualism in education and bilingual education: The state of the art in the United States. Papers from the 5th Nordic Conference on Bilingualism. Copenhagen: Royal Danish School of Educational Studies

Cummins, J. (1984). Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy. San Diego, CA: College Hill Press

De Jong, E.J. (1993a). [Evaluation of a Spanish-English transitional bilingual program] Unpublished raw data

De Jong, E.J. (1993b). [Observation data and interview transcripts from Dutch, Swedish, Danish language minority programs] Unpublished raw data

Edelsky, C. (1991). With literacy and justice for all. Rethinking the social in language and education. Bristol, PA: Falmer Press

Fase, W. (1994). Ethnic division in Western European education. New York: Waxmann Muenster

Flanigan, B. O. (1988). Second language acquisition in the elementary schools: the negotiation of meaning by native-speaking and nonnative-speaking peers. Bilingual Review, 14 (3), 25-40

Garcia, E.E. (1991a). Bilingualism, second language acquisition, and the education of Chicano language minority students. In Valencia, R.R. (Ed.). Chicano school failure and success: Research and policy agendas for the 1990s. (pp. 93-118), New York: Falmer Press

Garcia, E.E. (1991b.) Education of linguistically culturally diverse students: Effective instructional practices

Garcia, E.E. (1988). Attributes of effective schools for language minority students. Education and Urban Society, 20 (4), 387-398

Glenn, C.L., LaLyre, Y. (1991). Integrated bilingual education in the USA. In Jaspaert, K., Kroon, S. (Eds.). Ethnic minority languages and education. Amsterdam/Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger

Haeffele, H. (1988). L'acceuil des primo-arrivants: Pour... quoi? Comment? Migrants Formation, 73, June

Hagman, T., Lahdenpera, J. (1988). Nine years of Finnish-medium education in Sweden. Skutnabb-Kangas, T., Cummins, J. (Eds.). Minority education: From shame to struggle. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Johnson, E.K. (1994). Kids learn from kids. Unpublished manuscript. Harvard University

Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and practice in second langaue acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon

Lemberger, N. (1992). Bilingual teachers' voices. Paper presented at AERA, San Francisco, CA.

Lindholm, K.J., Alclan, Z.A. (1991). Bilingual proficiency as a bridge to academic achievement. Results from bilingual/Immersion programs. Journal of Education, 173 (2), 99-113

Long, M.H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. Applied Linguistics, 4 (2), 126-141

Long, M.H., Porter, P.A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. TESOL Quarterly, 19 (2), 207-228

Lucas, T. (1993). Secondary schooling for students becoming bilingual. Arias, M.B., Casanova, U. (Eds.). Bilingual Education: Politics, practice, research. (p. 113-143). Ninety-second yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press

Lucas, T., Henze, R., Donato, R. (1990). Promoting the success of Latino language-minority students: An exploratory study of six high schools. Harvard Educational Review, 60 (3), 315-340

McLaughlin, B. (1985). Second language acquisition in childhood: Volume 2. School-age children. Second Edition. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Minow, M. (1985). Learning to live with the dilemma of difference: Bilingual and special education. Law and Contemporary Problems, 48 (2), 157-211

Montero-Sieburth, M., Perez, M (1987). Echar Pa'lante, Moving onward: The dilemma's and strategies of a bilingual teacher. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 18(3), 180-189

Paulston, C.P. (1978). Rationales for bilingual educational reforms: A comparative assessment. Comparative Education Review, 22 (3), 402-419

Philips, S. (1972). Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classrooms. In C.B. Cazden, V. P. John, D. Hymes (Eds.), Functions of language in the classroom (pp.370-394). New York: Teachers College Press.

Snow, C. E. (1990). Rationales for native languae instruction: Evidence from research. In Padilla, A.M., Fairchild, H.H., Valadez, C.M. (Eds.). Bilingual education: Issues and strategies. (pp. 60-74). Newbury Park: SAGE

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. Gass, S.M, Madden,C.G. (Eds.) Input in second language acquisition. Rowley, MA: Newbury House

Tomlinson, S. (1984). Home, school and community. In Craft, M. (Ed.). Education and cultural pluralis n. London: Falmer Press

Varonis, E.M., Gass, S. (1984). Non-native/Non-native convsersations: a model for negotation of meaning. Applied Linguistics, 6 (1), 71-90

Weinberg, M. (1977). A chance the learn: The history of race and education in the United States. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Willig, A. C. (1985) A meta-Analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. Review of Educational Research, 55 (3), 269-317

Wong Fillmore, L. (1991). Second-language learning in children: A model of language learning in social context. In Bialystok, E. (Ed.). Language processing in bilingual children. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Zanger, V. (1991). Social and cultural dimensions of the education of language minority students. Ambert, A.N. (Ed.). Bilingual education and English as a second language. A research handbook, 1988-1990. New York, NY: Garland Publishing Inc.